

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
10 AT TACOMA

11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 ALEXANDER WALLS and REGINALD
IRVIN,

15 Defendant.

CASE NO. CR11-5408RJB

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
ORDER TO STRIKE DEMAND FOR
DISCOVERY

16 This matter comes before the court on the Motion to Strike Demand for Discovery (Dkt.
17 123). Because it appears to the court that the motion is based on a misunderstanding, the court
18 chooses to rule summarily without waiting for response.

19 Plaintiff moves to strike the demand for discovery and related relief (Dkt. 118), and
20 related documents (Dkts. 119, 120, 121 and 122). The subject documents are not motions
21 directed to the court, but are requests directed to the plaintiff. They require no action on the part
22 of the court, and the plaintiff may accede to the demands made, or not, as they choose in their
23 professional judgment. Accordingly, there is no reason to strike those documents.
24

1 For the foregoing reason, the Motion to Strike Demand for Discovery (Dkt. 123) is
2 hereby DENIED.

3 The Clerk is directed to send uncertified copies of this Order to all counsel of record and
4 to any party appearing *pro se* at said party's last known address.

5 Dated this 27th day of September, 2012.

6 
7

8 ROBERT J. BRYAN
9 United States District Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24